

**REMARKS**

**N.B.** Applicant calls to Examiner Blackman's attention the Information Disclosure Statement which was filed on **May 6, 2006**, and asks the Examiner to "consider" the listed documents and to return with her next communication an initialed copy of the Form PTO/SB/08 A & B to indicate such consideration of the two listed documents.

On page 4, the Examiner indicated that dependent claims 2-4 and 8-10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has rewritten claims 2 and 8 in independent form, whereby **claims 2-4 and 8-10** now should be allowed. Dependent claims 5, 6 and 11-14 have been amended to be dependent on their respective **allowable** parent claims 2 and 8, whereby **claims 5, 6 and 11-14** **also now should be allowable**.

The Examiner rejected the independent claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato '066.

Such a rejection requires that Kato disclose, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of each rejected claim, or in other words, that each rejected claim be readable on Kato's disclosure.

Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is **not** the case with respect to the amended claims 1 and 7.

The amended independent claims 1 and 7 now contain the limitation that the aspect ratio conversion unit comprises "means for adjusting an aspect ratio of a cross-section...according to the aspect ratio of the image information...", which limitation is derived from the first limitations

("a slit member...adjusts the aspect ratio of a cross-section of...") of the **allowable** original claims 2 and 8, respectively.

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that, as asserted by the Examiner, Kato discloses "an aspect ratio conversion unit which transmits light emitted from the integrator that does not correspond to an aspect ratio of image information back to the integrator and...", Kato certainly does **not** disclose, or even suggest, the limitation now recited in amended independent claims 1 and 7: "means for **adjusting** the aspect ratio of a cross-section of the integrator...according to the aspect ratio of the image information...".

Furthermore, Applicant notes that the Examiner does not even assert that Kato discloses this "adjusting" feature.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Kato is **incapable of anticipating** claims 1 and 7 (and their respective (new) dependent claims 15, 16 and 17, 18 which correspond respectively to original claims 3, 4 and 9, 10), whereby Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner also now to **allow** claims 1 and 7 and the new claims 15-18.

In summary, then, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 2-4 and 8-10, and also the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on anticipation by Kato '066, and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with all of **claims 1-18**; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/825,675

Filed concurrently herewith is a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of one month. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/  
John H. Mion  
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 8, 2006